

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings on the basis that the reference character 120 was used to designate both a slot in Fig. 4 and a tab in Fig. 6. The Examiner also objected to the drawings on the basis that the drawings do not identify the first and second slots, set forth in the claimed subject matter.

New drawing sheets are submitted herewith, which identify the outer area of the passage "90" in Figs. 4 and 5 with the reference character "117." This outer area was previously marked with reference character "120" in Fig. 4. Reference character "118" has been removed from Figs. 4, 7, and 8 because it duplicated reference character "82." The Examiner's careful review of the drawings is noted with appreciation.

The specification has been amended to reflect the corrections made to reference numerals in the drawings.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, and 20 because of informalities in the claims. The informalities noted by the Examiner have been addressed.

Claims 1-8, 10-14, 16, 17, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. The Examiner pointed out instances of incorrect claim language, which have been addressed and corrected by this response. Again, the Examiner's careful review of the claims is noted with appreciation.

Applicant's attorney has made every effort to place the application into condition for allowance with claims 1-8, 10-14, 16, 17 and 20, and such action is earnestly requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by phone if questions remain after consideration of this response, or if such would otherwise facilitate prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew S. McConnell
Reg. No. 32,272

7/14/08

Boyle Fredrickson, S.C.
840 North Plankinton Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53203
(414) 225-9755
Customer No.: 23598